

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 1-37 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 13, 21, 24, and 31 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added herein. Therefore, claims 1-37 remain pending in this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection, Mullins

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 10-13, 21, 24, 26-28, 31 and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,985,912 to Mullins et al. (hereinafter “Mullins”). The Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments pointing out significant differences between claims 1, 10-13, 21, 24, 26-28, 31 and 33-35 submitted by the Applicant and Mullins.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicant respectfully argues that Mullins fails to disclose each and every claimed element. For example, Mullins fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, determining a relational database from a plurality of data stores to service said request, wherein the plurality of data stores comprises the relational database and at least one LDAP directory.

As noted previously, Mullins “relates in general to enhancing database access and performance when correlating or translating one database to another database or to an object programming application.” (Col. 1, lines 13-16) Mullins references “a mapping system for handling data requested by an object software application model in a manner that is compatible with relational data stores.” (Col. 7, lines 28-31) “The mapping information can be used to map from objects to relational models or vice versa, objects to objects, object to COBAL or vice

versa, and object to XML and the like.” (Col. 7, lines 41-44) More specifically, Mullins describes a mapping system that includes “data in the first database format stored in the system; rules for translating from the first format to the second format stored as a separate structure from the data; and means for applying the rules to the data to obtain the second format.” (Col. 13, lines 13-17) That is, the rules of Mullins define the relationships between the objects and the database. (Col. 13, lines 40-48) However, Mullins does not disclose determining a relational database from a plurality of data stores to service said request, wherein the plurality of data stores comprises the relational database and at least one LDAP directory.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-12 depend, claim 13, upon which claims 14-20 depend, and claim 21, upon which claims 22 and 23 depend, each recite in part receiving a request to access data for one or more attributes, said request includes said attributes in a first data format and a filter for accessing the data of the attributes and determining a relational database from a plurality of data stores to service said request, wherein the plurality of data stores comprises the relational database and at least one LDAP directory. Mullins does not disclose determining a relational database from a plurality of data stores to service said request, wherein the plurality of data stores comprises the relational database and at least one LDAP directory. Rather, Mullins teaches translating one database to another database or to an object programming application.

Similarly, claim 24, upon which claims 25-30 depend, and claim 31, upon which claims 32-37 depend, both recite in part a partitioning module receiving access request information from said data source interface, wherein said partitioning module determines a relational database from a plurality of data stores to service said request, wherein the plurality of data stores comprises the relational database and at least one LDAP directory. Mullins does not disclose a partitioning module receiving access request information from said data source interface, wherein said partitioning module determines a relational database from a plurality of data stores to service said request, wherein the plurality of data stores comprises the relational

database and at least one LDAP directory. Rather, Mullins teaches translating one database to another database or to an object programming application.

For at least the previous reasons, claims 1, 10-13, 21, 24, 26-28, 31 and 33-35 are thought to be patentable over Mullins. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Mullins in view of Durand

The Office Action has rejected claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 17, 25, 29, 32 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullins in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,694,598 to Durand et al. (hereinafter “Durand”). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims for at least the reason that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 17, 25, 29, 32 and 36 each depend upon a base claim that is thought to be allowable as discussed in detail above.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Mullins in view of Bachmann

The Office Action has rejected claims 4, 16, 30, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullins in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,085, 188 to Bachmann et al. (hereinafter “Bachmann”). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims for at least the reason that claims 4, 16, 30, and 37 each depend upon a base claim that is thought to be allowable as discussed in detail above.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Mullins in view of Shen

The Office Action has rejected claims 7-9 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullins in View of U. S. Patent No. 5,596,746 to Shen et al. (hereinafter “Shen”). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims for at least the reason that claims 7-9 and 18-20 each depend upon a base claim that is thought to be allowable as discussed in detail above.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Mullins in view of Durand and further in view of Bachmann

The Office Action has rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullins in view of Durand and further in view of Bachmann. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims for at least the reason that claim 22 depends upon a base claim that is thought to be allowable as discussed in detail above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Dated: April 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Daley/

William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver office)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver office)

WJD:jep

61327008 v1